

# **SOUTH DAKOTA BOARD OF EDUCATION**

Public Hearing Minutes, September 19, 2006, Lake Area Technical Institute, Watertown, South Dakota

The South Dakota Board of Education convened a regular meeting at 8:15 a.m. on Monday, September 19, 2006, in room 509 of the Technical Education Center at Lake Area Technical Institute in Watertown, South Dakota.

## **Board Members**

Kelly Duncan, Glenna Fouberg, Richard Gowen, Marilyn Hoyt, Jan Nicolay, Roger Porch, and Clint Waara were present for the Board of Education meeting. Waara was absent from the joint Board of Education and Board of Regents meeting. Broome was absent from both meetings.

## **Department of Education Staff Present**

- Rick Melmer, Secretary, Office of the Secretary
- Kris Conzet, Department of Education Nicole Kranzler-Gacke, Executive Assistant, South Dakota Board of Education
- Michelle Mehlberg, Director, South Dakota Reading First, Office of Curriculum Technology & Assessment
- Keith Moore, Director, Office of Indian Education
- Jennifer Neuhauser, Assistant Director, Office of Accreditation & Teacher Quality
- Wade Pogany, Director, Office of Curriculum and Instruction
- Melody Schopp, Director, Office of Accreditation & Teacher Quality
- Stephanie Weideman, Director, Office of Curriculum, Technology & Assessment

## **Others Present**

Approximately 19 additional individuals attended all or part of the meeting. A list of those who signed the meeting register is filed in the Board secretary's office.

## **Agenda Items**

- 1) Adoption of the September 18-19, 2006 Agenda
- 2) Approval of the July 10, 2006 Meeting and Public Hearing Minutes
- 3) Guidance Central in South Dakota
- 4) Update on South Dakota Reading First
- 5) Grade Level Assessment Update and Achievement Series Demonstration
- 6) Update on the 2010 Education Initiative
- 7) Presentation on Watertown High School's Laptop Program
- 8) Update on the Office of Indian Education
- Joint Board of Education & Board of Regents Meeting
- 9) Request for Approval of a Burn Building on the Western Dakota Technical Institute Campus
- 10) Update on the Career and Technical Institutes
- 11) Report on the Senior Project Program
- 12) Report on the School District State Accreditation Rollout
- 13) Report on Administrative Rule Waivers
- 14) Secretary's Report

- 15) Report on the NAEP Writing Framework 2011 Planning Committee
  - 16) Public Hearing - Chapter 24:43:12 Distance Learning
  - 17) Public Hearing - Article 24:16 Teacher Preparation Program Approval and Article 24:53 Teacher Preparation Program Approval
  - 18) Presentation on Dakota State University's Teacher Preparation Program
  - 19) Date and Time of Next Meeting
- Executive Session

#### **AGENDA ITEM 1.0 - ADOPTION OF THE SEPTEMBER 18-19, 2006 AGENDA**

**Motion:** Motion by Fouberg and second Porch to adopt the September 18-19, 2006 agenda.

**Conclusion:** The motion carried.

#### **AGENDA ITEM 2.0 - APPROVAL OF THE JULY 10, 2006 MEETING AND PUBLIC HEARING MINUTES**

**Motion:** Motion by Waara and second by Fouberg to approve the July 10, 2006 meeting and public hearing minutes.

**Conclusion:** The motion carried.

#### **AGENDA ITEM 3.0 – GUIDANCE CENTRAL IN SOUTH DAKOTA**

Pogany gave an update on Guidance Central. He stated that Guidance Central software is the method that school guidance counselors will use to help students put together personal learning plans.

Pogany gave a demonstration of the software. He explained that software is designed to assess students' strengths and interests. School counselors then use the results in conjunction with the Guidance Central software to set an appropriate learning path for the students and to help them explore possible career interests. Pogany added that school districts are able to customize the software to their own course requirements.

Pogany explained the TestGEAR portion of the software. The software helps students determine the academic areas on which they need to focus more effort and helps them prepare for the ACT.

Pogany stated that ultimately the department would like to have the software available to parents so they could use the software with their children to help them plan their secondary and postsecondary careers.

#### **AGENDA ITEM 4.0 – UPDATE ON SOUTH DAKOTA READING FIRST**

Mehlberg relayed and explained data on the results of the last two years' implementation of the Reading First program. Ten school districts have been participating in the program.

Mehlberg relayed and explained the DIBELS screening results, which indicate the dramatic decrease in the numbers of students who are at risk for reading failure due to the Reading First program. Mehlberg explained the DIBELS screening process, which assesses student's

reading and language abilities. Overall, the DIBELS assessment results indicate that the vast majority of students involved in the Reading First program are improving.

Mehlberg reviewed the oral reading fluency data, which is the data that both the federal government and the state government use to assess the success and value of the Reading First program. This data also indicated that students are improving due to the Reading First program.

Mehlberg reviewed the Dakota STEP reading first results. The numbers of students at the proficient level are generally increasing across the board, while the numbers of those at the below basic level are decreasing.

Mehlberg stated that the department is confident that the Reading First program will be reauthorized by the federal government.

Mehlberg and the board discussed the program, how schools become involved in it, and how it is administered.

Mehlberg noted that several of the postsecondary institutes are looking at how to work Reading First program training into their teacher preparation programs.

#### **AGENDA ITEM 5.0 – GRADE LEVEL ASSESSMENT UPDATE AND ACHIEVEMENT SERIES DEMONSTRATION**

Weideman explained the achievement series, which is an online assessment tool that is available to administer grade-level assessments to students, and how the assessments were developed. She noted that the achievement series is a fixed-form assessment.

Weideman stated that the assessments should be available to school districts during the first week of October 2006.

Weideman demonstrated the online achievement series. She explained how the assessments could be used and administered, demonstrating how the tests can be customized. She noted that the test results are immediate and standards-based and explained how the results could be used.

Weideman stated that the department was providing training on the achievement series via the Education Service Agencies.

Weideman explained that teachers would be able to use the assessments to determine their students' areas of weakness so they can adjust their teaching methods and curriculum to address those needs. She noted that the assessments are available to school districts free of charge. She added that the department has received lots of good feedback has already been received on the assessments.

Melmer noted that there is a demand for end of course exams. The department is looking at developing the exams for the four core content areas as well as for foreign language courses. He noted that the assessments could also be used as placement exams or as test out exams.

#### **AGENDA ITEM 6.0 - UPDATE ON THE 2010 EDUCATION INITIATIVE**

Pogany gave an update on the status the tenets of the 2010 Education Initiative and showed the Board how to access the progress information via the Internet.

He noted that the department has received excellent feedback on the laptop initiative.

#### **AGENDA ITEM 7.0 - PRESENTATION ON WATERTOWN HIGH SCHOOL'S LAPTOP PROGRAM**

Lesli Hanson, Assistant Superintendent, Watertown School District, explained the goals of the laptop initiative.

Brad Brandsrud, Assistant Principal, Watertown High School, stated that the laptop initiative has given all students equal access to computers and to the Internet twenty-four hours a day. He explained how the computer systems are managed. Hanson noted that over 90% of Watertown students involved with the laptop initiative now have Internet access in their homes.

Brian Field, Principal, Watertown High School, explained that the school's website can be and is heavily used by both students and their parents.

Hanson explained that the fact that students have laptops has allowed for differentiated instruction and materials, which allows teachers to better customize their teaching to their students' needs, both advanced and special needs. Hanson explained some of the differentiated programs.

Hanson stated that the school district purchased only classroom sets of textbooks for the areas of math and science and then uploaded the textbooks onto each of the students' laptops. Each year as the curricula cycle through, the district will do the same for additional content areas. She noted that the process has saved the district money due to the decreased numbers of textbooks that must be bought.

Field explained that they are now incorporating the 21<sup>st</sup> century learning skills into their schools by creating lessons that integrate those lessons and skills into the classrooms. He noted that the high school has made a great effort to educate students in the proper and appropriate times and places to use their laptops appropriately.

Field Relayed data regarding how often students and teachers use the laptops to implement 21<sup>st</sup> century skills, which indicates a moderate level and on an upward swing.

Hanson explained that their students prefer to take exams online because they are most comfortable with the electronic format and ease in which it happens. She stated that students prefer typing the test and tend to give more input then they normally would.

They explained that they teach students how to determine the validity of the information they find on the Internet and noted that reluctant classroom learners tend to participate more fully in classroom discussions via the computer and give the teacher feedback via the computer.

Hanson stated that they have taught students about gearing their writing toward their audiences regarding their tone as well as vocabulary.

Hanson explained how teachers use the technology in their day to day instruction.

They explained that they use in-house surveys from students and teachers to obtain data as well as utilizing TIE to assist them obtain data on the usage of laptops.

Field Relayed that teachers are mostly positive about the usage of laptops and have indicated that they are not utilizing their laptops for managing their classrooms as much as they would like at present. The school district is now providing training on management. They explained some of the methods teachers can use to manage their classroom.

Brad Brandsrud said they have installed technology where instructors can monitor their students' computers from the front of the classrooms and impart to their students how to appropriately use their laptops during classtime.

Field a survey of parents showed that they felt that their students have showed improvement in many areas due to the availability of laptops.

Brandsrud explained some of the tools the school district is using with their laptops.

Hanson reviewed the necessary steps they have had to take in ensure a successful laptop program.

Hanson explained how the district prepared for the implementation of the laptop initiative into their school district. She explained how they secure funding for the necessary electronics; she noted that in Watertown it has been a community project.

Brandsrud explained how the district manages the students' computers and software so they can be used only for appropriate purposes and so that they will not be able to access inappropriate content.

The Board discussed the fact that fewer parents of students in school districts with the laptop initiative attend parent teacher conferences because they have the ability to keep up to date on their students grades at all times. Nicolay noted that the information access also eliminated much of the conflicts between parents and teachers.

#### **AGENDA ITEM 8.0 – UPDATE ON THE OFFICE OF INDIAN EDUCATION**

Moore explained that one of the greatest challenges for the SD GEAR UP program is facing finding matching funding.

Stacy Phelps, Director, South Dakota GEAR UP Program, explained the goals of the program. Moore explained that one of the mindsets they are trying to change is the fact that a number of the reservation schools that serve a large number of Native American students do not have high expectations of their students and do not hold them to the same curriculum requirements as other students. Ted Hamilton, Director, Oceti Sakowin Education Consortium explained how they are trying to change the mindset that their students are not expected to go to postsecondary schools.

Phelps noted that 24 schools involved in the program and explained the program implementation process and challenges as well as their progress. Hamilton explained how they hope to address some of the program hurdle and detailed the middle school and the high school program.

Phelps relayed data on the success of the GEAR UP program, noting that they are constantly looking at ways to further improve the program and its results. He explained the focuses they have for improving the program and their plans for moving forward. He noted that students are currently exposed to the Regental programs and that they hope to expose them to the technical education programs. He noted that they would like to align themselves with Upward Bound and vice versa to ensure the continued success. He added that they are looking at improving their program to make it seamless from 7<sup>th</sup> through post secondary schools. – Nicolay recommended that GEAR UP look at modeling their program after Killian College's program.

Hamilton explained that the Consortium is working on how to develop more Native American postsecondary teachers.

Hamilton noted that there is an open enrollment process at the high school-level program, which allows kids of all cultures to be involved in the GEAR UP program. He also noted that they do not let the kids choose their roommates or cohorts. All of these things help ensure diverse experiences.

Phelps explained that the program retention is 70% with 10% go into the military. -Initially finding funding for post-secondary education was an issue so the program has developed a financial education program for students and their parents. The program acknowledged that while students go through withdrawal from being away from home for six weeks their parents encouraged the students to stay at the program.

## **JOINT BOARD OF EDUCATION & BOARD OF REGENTS MEETING**

See joint meeting minutes.

### **AGENDA ITEM 9.0 – REQUEST FOR APPROVAL OF A BURN BUILDING ON THE WESTERN DAKOTA TECHNICAL INSTITUTE CAMPUS**

Rick Gray, Vice President, Western Dakota Technical Institute (WDTI) reviewed that the Board had approved a WDTI program for an associate's degree in fire science two and half years ago. He noted that the program is in high demand, is always filled, and has a waiting

list. He added that the program enjoys strong partnerships with surrounding area fire departments.

Gray explained that it was determined that there was a dire need for a good fire training facility for WDTI's fire science program, as well as for the Rapid City and surrounding fire departments. The groups need a training facility that law enforcement and the fire departments could use to practice and work together.

Gray explained what the proposed burn building is and how it would be used. He stated that the Rapid City approved \$500,000 to erect the building last spring. He described the location of the building and explained why it was the most appropriate location. Gray stated that the Rapid City City Council and the Rapid City Area School District had both approved the erection of the building on the property on which it now stands. Gray requested Board approval to use the burn building as such and on the state property on which it stands.

J. J. Linn, Health and Education Facilities Authority, explained the supplemental contracts (see documents filed in the office of the Board Secretary), which required Board approval. He stated that the Board's approval would give WDTI, the Rapid City fire department and surrounding fire departments possession of the burn building without tying the building to the land on which it was built.

**Motion:** Motion by Porch and second by Nicolay to approve the seventh and eleventh supplements.

**Conclusion:** The motion carried.

#### **AGENDA ITEM 10.0 – UPDATE ON THE CAREER AND TECHNICAL INSTITUTES**

Jeff Holcomb, Director, SouthEast Technical Institute (SETI), stated that the majority of the institute's faculty turned over during the summer. He noted that first year student enrollment is up but the second year returning student enrollment is down. He speculated that many students chose to enter the workforce to earn money rather than return to school because the workforce shortage has caused employers to offer better pay. Holcomb stated that the business community's need for technically educated workers has never been higher so the institute needs to work closely with the business community to develop programs that will produce the workers that will fit the community's needs.

Rick Gray stated that enrollment at WDTI has remained strong. He noted that the institute is rebuilding a couple of their programs to increase their capacity and efficiency. Gray stated that WDTI has experienced the same lack of returning students this year for the same reasons Holcomb mentioned. Gray relayed that WDTI has received several grants that will bolster some of the institute's programs.

Theresa Kriese, Vice President of Administrative Services/CFO, Mitchell Technical Institute (MTI), stated that MTI has seen a slight enrollment increase this year. She noted that the

institute is working on developing off-campus locations that can be used as learning facilities for the institute's high-demand utility programs.

Deb Shepherd, President, Lake Area Technical Institute (LATI), stated that enrollment at LATI has increased. She too said that area employers, desperate for workers, were trying to keep their student in the workforce with them by offering better pay. Shepherd noted that LATI is looking at ways to recruit students from additional demographic populations by implementing creative ways to offer classes, such as online. She stated that the business community is concerned that the technical institutes will not be able to produce enough highly skilled technical workers to fill the positions of the ever-increasing number of retirees. Shepherd explained that LATI is looking at ways to expose secondary students to technical careers at an earlier age to increase their awareness of technical careers so they will have some idea of which technical degrees/careers they might like to obtain when they graduate high school.

The Board asked what the percentage of the technical institutes' students is Native American. WDTI said around 10% of their students are Native American, and LATI, MTI, and SETI said around 2% of their students are. The Board encouraged the institutes to keep the Native American student population in mind and to look at ways to recruit more Native American students. Gray noted that WDTI has been developing programs that could be presented to students on the reservations to teach them about technical education careers and the need for good job skills. Nicolay encouraged the institutes to join up with the Gear Up program to get young Native American students onto the technical institute campuses.

The Board requested that the institutes present the Board with their final total enrollment numbers, a breakdown of enrollment program by program, and enrollment data from previous years at the November Board meeting.

Mitch Richter explained that there is an increasing need for technically skilled workers due to both new business growth and an increasingly high worker retirement rate.

Richter explained how the institutes are currently funded. He stated that the institutes feel the distribution formula still needs to be reformulated and that the institutes are still underfunded.

Richter stated that the institutes had been working on a governance proposal for the last 18 months, but that the institutes' local school districts feel that the institutes' lack of funding is a more critical concern than the need to change the institutes' governance structure. He relayed that the institutes' local school districts feel that the Council of Technical Institutes, which was dissolved a few years ago, should be reestablished in order to enable talks about improving technical education at the secondary and post secondary levels. Richter explained that because the school districts are not ready to move forward with proposing a new governance structure, the institutes have placed the issue on the back burner.

Duncan responded with her concern that if the school district superintendents and the technical institute directors do not come up with their own governance proposal, someone else will. The Board felt strongly that the institutes should develop a governance proposal to



present to the legislature so the legislature does not adopt one of its own, which the institutes would then be forced to adopt. Richter said a revised governance plan has been worked on but that not all parties agreed on it.

Melmer explained how the Council of Technical Institutes worked and stated that he felt that the reestablishment of the committee would not have any significant impact on the governance of the institutes and that it was therefore an ineffective idea. Richter responded that the school districts do not feel that a change in governance will improve their clout, which the districts feel they need in order to obtain additional funding. He added that from the school districts' prospective the budget issue is paramount over the governance issue because it directly impacts whether the institutes can keep their current programs running and implement new ones.

Duncan recommended that both the school district superintendents and the technical institute directors come to the November Board meeting to discuss funding and governance. The Board recommended that a separate work session be held in conjunction to the November Board meeting for this purpose. Nicolay recommended holding such a meeting earlier in the fall in order to ensure that a proposal would be ready for the legislature in December. Porch noted that a work session might not be enough to ensure any significant changes. Richter noted that the technical institute directors were planning to meet on October 27 in Pierre and added that the date would be a good time to hold a discussion about funding and governance. Melmer suggested that the meeting could be held via phone conference in October so long as the necessary documentation was prepared and sent to the Board ahead of time. Richter stated that a face-to-face meeting would be more effective. The Board discussed when and how to hold the meeting.

**Motion:** Motion by Nicolay to instruct the technical institute directors and their local school district superintendents to prepare a proposal for a governance structure different from the present governance structure for the Board's review by November 1, 2006.

Richter recommended meeting on Sunday, October 15, 2006.

**Motion:** Porch seconded the motion.

Melmer noted that the Board could create a subcommittee of the Board to meet with the technical institute directors and their superintendents prior to the due date of the proposal in order to discuss the proposal.

**Conclusion:** The motion carried.

The Board determined that Gowen, Hoyt, and Nicolay, the four local school district superintendents, and the four tech institute directors should meet for a discussion session regarding governance and funding.

The Board stated that it felt very strongly about technical institute governance and that it and the institutes should be proactive about creating a new governance structure proposal.

Gowen requested that the technical institutes get their budget information to the Board. Richter noted that the technical institutes still do not all use the same budget format because each is attached to different school districts. He explained that each institute has a unique relationship with its respective school district. Nicolay requested that the institutes also include a rationale for why their budget requests are what they are and a breakdown explaining the allocation of their funds.

The Board discussed how the institutes handle prospective students who are not able to enroll in the programs they wish to due to the programs already being booked to capacity. The institute directors explained that some students begin taking preliminary coursework while they wait for a slot to open up in their program of choice, but that others go back into the workforce and do not return to the institutes.

The Board discussed how the institutes' budget proposals to the legislature are handled. Gowen stated that the new governance proposal should include the institutes' budget plans.

#### **AGENDA ITEM 11.0 – REPORT ON THE SENIOR PROJECT PROGRAM**

Kucker explained the Senior Project program and how it can be managed within a school district (see documents filed in the office of the Board secretary). She noted that while the program is available to all school districts, it is not required. Senior Projects are capstone experiences, which include four phases: paper, product, portfolio, and presentation. Each student has a community mentor. The Projects are designed to be individual learning experiences.

Kucker stated that while most students balk when they are initially told they will have to do a Senior Project, most are glad they did it when their Projects are completed.

Kucker explained that the department is working on developing the option for students to receive career and technical education credit for their Senior Projects.

Melmer asked if the Senior Projects are required to incorporate the four core content areas. Kucker said there is currently no requirement but responded that it would be a good idea to include such a requirement into the program's framework.

Kucker stated that currently both the Kimball and Emery School Districts require Senior Projects. She noted that many school districts are now working on implementing the Senior Project program in their school district.

#### **AGENDA ITEM 15.0 - REPORT ON THE NAEP WRITING FRAMEWORK 2011 PLANNING COMMITTEE**

Fouberg stated that NAEP Writing Framework 2011 planning committee just held its fifth meeting. She explained the changes that the committee has determined should be made to the 2011 writing framework and test administration process.

November 20-December 1 will be the last meeting of the committee.

#### **AGENDA ITEM 14.0 – SECRETARY’S REPORT**

Melmer reported on the following items:

- The State Library restructuring plan is under revision. A project implementation plan is being developed and will be ready soon; Melmer stated that he would get a copy of the plan to the Board. He noted that the State Library had contracted with Technology and Innovations in Education (TIE) to work on implementing the restructuring plans.
- The Indian Education Summit, September 24-26, 2006.
- The addendums to the 21<sup>st</sup> Century Grants and the Child and Adult Nutrition Services.
- State Aid Study Task Force met in early September. The committee’s final meeting will be November 15, 2006, which is also the due date for the committee’s final report.
- The department’s budget hearing with the Bureau of Finance and Management will be September 27, 2006.

The department is still getting questions from school districts on what types of activities count as meeting the ½ credit of physical education or health that is required by high school graduation requirements. The department is working on developing a written definition that would eliminate the questions. The Board discussed whether the ½-credit requirement should be increased.

#### **AGENDA ITEM 12.0 – REPORT ON THE SCHOOL DISTRICT STATE ACCREDITATION ROLLOUT**

Neuhauser relayed the requirements school districts must meet to obtain state accreditation (see brochure filed in the office of the Board secretary). She explained the accreditation process.

Neuhauser stated that she has received lots of positive feedback from the school districts.

The Board and Neuhauser discussed the onsite visit review process and its validity.

Neuhauser explained how the state accreditation process helps schools meet the requirements of the No Child Left Behind Act. The Board discussed differences between NCLB and the state accreditation requirements.

#### **AGENDA ITEM 13.0 - REPORT ON ADMINISTRATIVE RULE WAIVERS**

Neuhauser gave an update on the administrative rule waivers currently in place (see documents file in the office of the Board secretary). She explained the purpose of administrative rule waivers and how the approval process works.

Neuhauser relayed some clarification issues that have come up regarding administrative rule waivers. Neuhauser noted that she would be holding DDN sessions with school districts around the state to clarify for school districts what the graduation requirements are and what school districts need to do to meet the requirements of both the high school graduation requirements and the administrative rule waivers.

Gowen voiced concern that so many schools have received waivers for Algebra I. Melmer explained that the intent of granting waivers for Algebra I is to allow students to be able to

take more upper-level math courses during their high school years. The Board was concerned that some school districts use their waiver for Algebra I to water down their math curriculum.

Sam Gingerich, Chief Academic, Officer of the Board of Regents, relayed the Opportunity Scholarship requirements, which require four years of math, Algebra I or higher. He noted that the Board of Regents has the same concerns about the waivers that the Board of Education does. The Board suggested that schools could be allowed to offer Algebra I to eighth graders but not for high school credit. Neuhauser responded that schools are currently able to do so.

Gowen noted that if a student takes four years of high school level math, but some of their math courses are watered down, that student will not be adequately prepared for postsecondary education level math. Neuhauser agreed with the Board and noted that the department had already been discussing its concern that districts may be using the waivers to water down their Algebra I courses. Melmer recommended that the Board schedule a discussion about the issue for a future Board meeting. He noted that the only way to really know whether eighth grade Algebra I courses are meeting curriculum requirements would be to require end-of-course exams. Gowen recommended that such a requirement be included as a part of the application process for obtaining a rule waiver.

The Board discussed whether waivers should be allowed for Algebra I at all. Duncan was concerned that some schools may be using the waivers to force all eighth grade students to take Algebra I whether they are ready for the course or not. Melmer questioned the appropriateness of disallowing waivers for math in order to ensure that students are not forced into classes they are not ready for while at the same time all ninth grade students are moved into ninth grade English whether they are ready or not. Nicolay recommended that the Board keep in mind that some students need the additional challenge that taking higher levels of math in lower grade levels would provide. The Board discussed the issue further and requested that an additional discussion on the topic be scheduled for the November Board meeting.

#### **AGENDA ITEM 16.0 – PUBLIC HEARING– CHAPTER 24:43:12 DISTANCE LEARNING**

Schopp explained that the proposed rules will extend the rules the Board originally approved governing distance learning. The proposed rules would give the department the authority to create the South Dakota Virtual High School.

**Motion:** Motion by Nicolay and second by Hoyt to adopt chapter 24:43:12 Distance Learning.

**Conclusion:** The motion carried.

#### **AGENDA ITEM 17.0 – PUBLIC HEARING – ARTICLE 24:16 TEACHER PREPARATION PROGRAM APPROVAL AND ARTICLE 24:53 TEACHER PREPARATION PROGRAM APPROVAL**

Schopp explained that the proposed rules will rewrite the teacher preparation program standards. The basis for the proposed rules was to align them to national standards. She stated that the department will be working with the Board of Regents to provide training to the postsecondary institutes to help them implement the new rules.

Schopp noted that additional adjustments to the proposed rules may be forthcoming.

Schopp stated that the department was requesting Board approval of the rules but with a repeal date of June 31, 2008 and article 24:53 Teacher Preparation Program Approval with an implementation date of July 1, 2008.

Nicolay voiced concern that the proposed rules do not seem to hold teacher preparation programs to enough accountability to ensure that areas of weakness that are found within their programs are improved. Schopp explained the survey review process the department is working on, which would help the department better determine whether the programs are meeting all of the program standards. She added that an annual report on the teacher preparation programs will be available soon, which will relay the status of each of the programs. Schopp noted that department is also looking at developing a method that will require a yearly review of each of the teacher preparation programs. Melmer added that the Board does have the final say as to whether a teacher preparation program may begin or continue operation.

Sam Gingerich spoke in support of the proposed rules citing the fact that the rules are written so that they are in line with National Council for Accreditation of Teacher Education (NCATE) standards due to South Dakota's partnership with NCATE, and the fact that the standards within the proposed rules speak specifically to the outcomes of teacher preparation programs in order to ensure that teacher candidates are highly qualified when they enter the workforce. He noted that the department has worked closely with the teacher preparation programs in developing the rules.

**Motion:** Motion by Gowen and second by Fouberg to adopt article 24:16 Teacher Preparation Program Approval with a repeal date of June 31, 2008 and article 24:53 Teacher Preparation Program Approval with an implementation date of July 1, 2008.

**Conclusion:** The motion carried.

## **AGENDA ITEM 18.0 - PRESENTATION ON DAKOTA STATE UNIVERSITY'S TEACHER PREPARATION PROGRAM**

Dr. Tom Hawley gave an overview of Dakota State University's (DSU) teacher preparation program (see documents filed in the office of the Board secretary). He noted that DSU carefully monitors the outcome of its program and whether its teacher candidates obtain teaching positions and are successful in those positions.

Dr. Crystal Pauli, Director, Field Services, reviewed the purpose of the field experiences teacher candidates participate in and explained how the experiences are woven into student's teacher preparation programs. Nicole Huiten, Major, Elementary/Special Education, stated

that her sophomore experience helped her determine whether she really wanted to teach. Pauli described the topics DSU covers in its teacher preparation program seminars.

Hawley explained DSU's Master's in Educational Technology program. He noted that the program is very popular and is available both online and in person.

Hawley reviewed DSU's data collection processes. DSU uses the data to continuously improve its teacher preparation programs.

Hawley reviewed DSU's recent undergraduate initiatives, which are designed to address areas of need, and its K-12 partnerships and campus initiatives.

Dr. Rich Avery, Associate Professor, Mathematics, explained DSU's and Madison Central School's My Math Lab program, which is a computer assisted instruction program that helps students become self-learners. Avery noted that the program was highly successful, moving students who would have had to take remedial math upon entering college into regular general college math education courses. Avery is working with eleven school districts to implement the My Math Lab program. He explained the various ways the program could be used within a school system. Melmer recommended a method be worked out to notify parents of South Dakota students that their child is in line to take remedial math upon entering postsecondary education and to recommend the My Math Lab program to them as a way to ensure that their students get the extra assistance they need to avoid entering remedial math. The Board discussed the possibilities.

#### **AGENDA ITEM 19.0 - DATE AND TIME OF NEXT MEETING**

The next Board meeting will be held on November 13-14, 2006 in Conference Room 3 of the Kneip Building in Pierre.

#### **EXECUTIVE SESSION**

**Motion:** Motion by Nicolay and second by Porch to go into executive session for the purpose of litigation and personnel issues at 2:32 p.m.

**Conclusion:** The motion carried.

**Motion:** Motion by Fouberg and second by Hoyt to adjourn executive session at 3:36 p.m.

**Conclusion:** The motion carried.

**Motion:** Motion by Fouberg and second by Hoyt to adjourn.

**Conclusion:** The motion carried.

I, Rick Melmer, Executive Officer of the South Dakota Board of Education, declare the foregoing to be a complete and true record of the minutes of the South Dakota Board of Education held on September 18-19, 2006.

Rick Melmer